



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,374	10/05/2005	Patrick Meynier	612.44903X00	4781
20457	7590	11/27/2007	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP			HELLNER, MARK	
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1800			3663	
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/27/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/529,374	MEYNIER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Hellner	3663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 45-78 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 45 and 73-78 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 46-72 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 45 and 73 – 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baroni et al in view of Owen (6,488,117).

Baroni et al disclose a device for emitting waves into formation, the device comprising: at least one vibrator (4,5); two plates (2, 3); at least one motive element (the electric elements of the electromechanical transducers 4 and 5) suited to generate vibrations and to communicate them to the plates; and a generator (7) for applying periodic control signals to the motive element.

Figure 1 shows the vibrator positioned in a cavity and embedded in at least one solid material C to provide coupling thereof with an underground formation with the material being in contact with the end faces of the plates via a material 6.

The difference between claim 45 and Baroni et al is the use of means for further increasing coupling of the at least one vibrator with the at least one solid material

Owen is cited to show that it was known at the time of the present application to have provided means (125 and 132) for further coupling the base plate of a vibrator to a solid material.

It would have been obvious to have applied the teaching of Owen to the device of Baroni et al for the following reasons:

The device of Owen et al is similar to the device of Boroni et al; and

The serrated surface disclosed by Owen et al provided better coupling than the flat surface of Baroni et al.

The combination of Baroni et al and Owen produces claim 45

Claim 78 is taught by Owen.

The functions recited by claims 73-77 read on the device of figure 1 of Baroni et al as modified by Owen, when operated by the control signal generator 7.

Claims 46-72 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see the amendment, filed 09/07/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 45 and 73-77 under 35 USC 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the new rejection recited above under 35 USC 103.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references cited show the level of skill in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark Hellner at telephone number 571 272 6981.

Mark Hellner

Primary Examiner

AU 3663

Mark Hellner